

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 03 Oct 1999 12:32:04 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

>Whoever posted this:

>THANK YOU THANK YOU.

>This is what I have been wanting to see for 3 years. This is the only
>reason I keep subscribed to this newsgroup, which has otherwise become a
>garbage can of hate and ugliness. Notice that Ted doesn't say one word
>about hatred for Jews, Blacks or any other ethnic group.

>

>AWESOME !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

TK -> While the mainstream press has not been eager to report on this story, they
know I spent 28 hours talking to TK in June and July of this year.

I found him to be a very interesting and complex person. I did not find him to
be at all racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. He is just firmly convinced that the
critique would be better directed at the techno-industrial system, not the
various social pathologies it engenders.

I happen to share his belief that basically human beings took a wrong turn at
sedentary agriculture, and that the root causes of social inequality derive
from the difficulties inherent in trying to maintain a heirarchical society and
a complex material culture.

The anarcho-primitivist writer John Zerzan has elaborated on this quite
eloquently.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 04 Oct 1999 00:56:43 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

>As far as Ted not being a racist, you didn't ask him
>about those thieving Gypsies, or those stupid, violent
>Blacks, now did you? <g> Also, his comments re: the
>Russian Revolution (alluding to the way the Jews killed
>up to 60 million Gentiles), Rwanda and the Balkans are
>revealing -- but you missed it, of course.

W -> I didn't ask him about "those stupid, violent
Blacks" as you put it... because he holds no such racist opinions... as a
matter of fact, one of the first things he brought up in the interview was how
he believes it is very important for revolutionaries to reach out to inner-city
minority and impoverished populations who are already on the verge of rebellion
as a result of their treatment by the system.

But to assert that the system itself is responsible for their predicament and
get away from the black vs white, rich vs poor false dichotomy.

Our discussion of the Russian revolution was concerned with analyzing how a
determined minority can succeed in disrupting the power structure, specifically
we discussed the influence the anarchists had in that conflict.

His point is, that if the system collapses, those scenarios are likely, not
that we should be hoping for that, on the contrary, we should be working
towards finding a way to make people lose confidence in the techno-industrial
system, and believe that revolution against the system is possible.

>The implication is clear:
>racism, hate groups, and other forms of social unrest
>inimical to the system should be encouraged, if it can
>bring the industrial system down. Indeed, that's
>exactly what he goes on to say: "In a general way, I
>think what has to be done is not to try and convince
>or persuade the majority of people that we are right,
>as much as try to increase tensions in society to the
>point where things start to break down."

-> Yes, this is what he said. But what he feels needs to be done, though, as
evidenced by the Ship of Fools essay, is to redirect the rebellion to be
against the techno-industrial system. If each interest group is just fighting
for a bigger piece of the pie, that does nothing to hasten the collapse of the
system.

The goals of the revolutionary are relevant - i.e. undermining the system -
social chaos for the sake of redistribution of the wealth is not the goal.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 04 Oct 1999 13:25:02 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

>You need to read ISAIIF again. Para. 29 is
>quite clear that Blacks differ from Whites
>in that they are, if left to themselves,
>naturally more violent, and "not interested
>in studying technical subjects", a euphemism
>for stupid.

WK -> I still believe that TK has no anti-black sentiments. His analysis of how various minorities, not just African Americans, relate to the system is one that takes into consideration the historical realities of how certain populations have been disenfranchised by the dominant white culture as a result of racism - in a sense never really made part of the system, even blatantly abused by it, so they are more willing to listen to a profound critique. He considers this to be a superior position, not an inferior one.

>The system couldn't care less
>what kind of music a man listens to, what kind of
>clothes he wears or what religion he believes in as
>long as he studies in school, holds a respectable job,
>climbs the status ladder, is a "responsible" parent, is
>nonviolent and so forth. In effect, however much he may
>deny it, the oversocialized leftist wants to integrate
>the black man into the system and make him adopt its
>values."

-> TK is a primitivist, first and foremost, his understanding of socio-cultural evolution is one that recognizes that the dominant white, western culture seeks intellectual and cultural hegemony - outsiders, those who have have non-industrial, non "civilized" ancestral heritage and values are his natural allies. I think that is what is apparent in the text you quote above.

>Buy guns for Farrakhan, maybe. "Reaching out" as you
>put it, by bringing urban Blacks into the system, is
>definitely NOT on TK's agenda.

-> He does not advocate, and I did not say he did, "bringing them into the system" anyone who is dissatisfied with the system should join the rebellion, not the system.

>Your language marks you as some kind of converted
>Marxist.

-> If that is supposed to be an insult, fuck off. I have long ago decided to make it my policy to not react to silly "radicaler-than-thou" accusations about being a leftist.

>I'd be interested in knowing more details
>about your relationship with TK. If you actually
>did talk to him at all, it's odd that he would pick
>a crypto-leftist like you to confide in. But then,
>he probably doesn't have a lot of choice about such
>matters these days.

- > TK approached me with the offer of an interview because he knows who I am. He was familiar with my writing and my activist credentials, which I feel no need to recite to you. It is public knowledge (as reported in the Boston Globe, 9/30 and on various wire service reports) that I was working as an editor at the Earth First! Journal when I conducted the interviews.

>But why not post the text of your discussion, instead
>of just asking us to take your word for it? I'm not
>convinced you understand his ideas. I'd rather see
>and interpret his words myself.

- > I did post the first article I written about the interviews, which appears in the latest issue of Green Anarchist - to get a copy you can write to GA/USA POB 11131, Eugene, OR 97440, send \$3. I do intend to write more in the future.

>But let's extrapolate from TK's parable. If
>widespread fighting breaks out on the ship, and
>many are killed (possibly even the Captain, eh?),
>if any are left alive at the end of the fight,
>maybe *then* the ship will be turned around. Or
>maybe the cabin boy will seize control of the ship
>in all the confusion, and turn her around.
>
>Do you understand now?

- > I understand that there are many of us who believe that the current social chaos - school shootings, civil wars, rise of hate groups, etc - are all symptoms of the illness that is industrial civilization. We don't relish that fact, even though we acknowledge it.

The point is to attribute these manifestations to their proper cause and try to reverse the situation; instead of just fiddling while Rome burns, suggest positive alternatives. After all, the object of the revolution is to restore harmony between humans and the natural world, not increase suffering.

Do not forget that at its base, TK's and other eco-anarchist's philosophies are pro-nature, i.e. pro "the wild". There are models from prehistory we can use to argue that there was a time when people lived in harmony with wild nature. It is not abstract political theory - we have real, empirical, physical evidence that supports this claim.

TK advocates a "future primitive" he talks the talk and he walked the walk, that's one of the things that makes him unique.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 05 Oct 1999 04:17:56 GMT

From: susanj1111@aol.com (SusanJ1111)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Greenanarchist,

I'd like to add my thanks to Shadow for your putting up this article, which had many quotes from TK, hence, in his own words, n'est-ce pas?

There are a number of passages from ISAIF (Paragraph 192 especially) which show that TK is not a racist and I'm glad that you are here to support this. There is also no known evidence from his journals to support any claims of racism or neo-nazism. Who are we going to believe, the guys with the idée fixe (superglued) or someone who has spoken with TK?

So, it's nice to see the group getting back to the kind of discussions it used to have.

Just so you know, this group has been a delightful discussion center for questioning technology, for environmental questions and for topics related to individual resistance to the troubles caused by aspects of modern life. It's only been during the lull of the summer and with no news that certain types have decided to take this group over. Rest assured, there are a number of people here who are more interested in talking to the issues you bring up than those sad souls are.

>I did post the first article I written about the interviews, which appears in
>the latest issue of Green Anarchist - to get a copy you can write to GA/USA
>POB
>11131, Eugene, OR 97440, send \$3. I do intend to write more in the future.

Glad to hear it, and please, keep us informed. And welcome!

>I understand that there are many of us who believe that the current social
>chaos - school shootings, civil wars, rise of hate groups, etc - are all
>symptoms of the illness that is industrial civilization. We don't relish that
>fact, even though we acknowledge it.

This was mentioned in ISAIF - see paragraph 176, "...They would seek other, dangerous outlets (drugs, crime, "cults," hate groups)..."

>The point is to attribute these manifestations to their proper cause and try
>to
>reverse the situation; instead of just fiddling while Rome burns, suggest
>positive alternatives. After all, the object of the revolution is to restore
>harmony between humans and the natural world, not increase suffering.

I would agree here. Now, what do you think of what TK wrote in ISAIF suggesting that there were other possible ways that this objective might be fulfilled? This is what interested me.

-Susan

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 05 Oct 1999 13:28:32 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

snowe@rain.org writes:

>Also, he did rely a lot on outside support.

AK -> Very minimally. I think all of us in the movement, at this stage, are forced to deal with aspects of modern life we wish we didn't have to as a matter of survival. It is an unfortunate compromise. Just like I am sitting here this a.m. dealing with this machine that I most certainly detest.

>What makes TK visible is bombing people, something that was really
>underplayed in the interview.

-> While he placed no limits on what I could ask him, I respected his right to decline to comment on the specifics of the unabom case.

>What are you for?

etc. -> If one has to put a label on it, then I would declare that I am an anarcho-primivist. That is, I believe that we should be working towards a social/ecological ideal that is based on models from prehistory, specific to each bioregion.

Like TK, I have studied the subject very intensively. If one is acting from the biocentric point of view, i.e. the greatest amount of good for the greatest amount of living things, as I am, then the obvious ideal is a semi-nomadic hunter-gatherer subsistence strategy. Basically, return to living the way human beings managed to live quite nicely for the majority of their existence.

That way of life is most conducive to human freedom and happiness, and equality for all species.

>Are you convinced that the whole shebang must be
>undone? That it can be undone?

Yep, and further, that eventually will be undone whether we are ready to acknowledge it or not. I think it is the epitome of arrogance to believe otherwise. I have studied the rise and fall of civilizations. They are like organisms, they have their birth, their fluorescence and eventually their demise. We see it time and time again.

It does, in some ways, come down to a moral, almost metaphysical question, why then, in light of what I believe, would activists like myself choose to act? It is perplexing. I guess it comes down to wanting to minimize the suffering that has to be endured.

I think a very important point is that we here in the industrialized world are leading the "developing" world down this incredibly complicated and ultimately destructive dead-end path.

There are a few places left out there on the planet where indigenous people have managed to retain their traditional lifeways, living in harmony with wild nature. I believe that revolutionaries in the industrialized world have a responsibility to rebel against the techno-industrial system in solidarity with these people. Here in the heart of Babylon, we need to demonstrate that all is

not sweetness and light for those who are looking at us as a model. Don't come this way, it is fraught with danger and misery.

>Would you favor undoing the libraries that TK used so much?

>They're part of the "system" too. I don't think I'd want to be separated

>from our intellectual and cultural tradition in

>the name of techno-free purity.

It is a dilemma and we discussed that. But the reality is that the codification of knowledge - books - have been one of the major handmaidens of conquest and exploitation. I would suggest reading "Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies" by Jared Diamond, 1997; W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. New York.

In it he writes:

"...some parts of the world developed literate industrial societies with metal tools, other parts developed only nonliterate farming societies... others retained societies of hunter-gatherers with stone tools. Those historical inequalities have cast long shadows over the modern world, because the literate societies have conquered or exterminated the other societies. While those differences constitute the most basic fact of world history, the reasons for them remain uncertain and controversial."

>Did you ever ask TK what became of his mathematical interests?

Yes, I did. I am reluctant to paraphrase him, he spoke quite eloquently on this subject. But the gist of it was that he never assigned mathematics the same level of importance that his colleagues did. He thought that it represented a "surrogate activity" to them, and he personally felt it was much more important to try to figure out how to solve real world problems than mathematical problems.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 05 Oct 1999 14:00:35 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

>From: susanj1111@aol.com (SusanJ1111)
>Date: Tue, 05 October 1999 12:17 AM EDT
>Message-id: <19991005001756.21934.00000958@ng-fr1.aol.com>

>Greenanarchist,

>I'd like to add my thanks to Shadow for your putting up this article, which
>had
>many quotes from TK, hence, in his own words, n'est-ce pas?

Thank you for your kind words.

Yes, the quotes were taken directly from the transcripts. As was our agreement, he read and ok'd the piece before it was published. That article was written for publication in the EF! Journal, they declined to publish it, so with TK's permission, I gave it to Green Anarchist.

I understand that people on the ML are sceptical, both of my claims to have spoken with him (but I really did) and of my interpretation of his thought.

I am actually quite reluctant to represent his ideas and I feel more comfortable relating my own opinions. But he and I both acknowledged that we do have an awfully lot in common in terms of our critique. I have thought & written about the subjects I have discussed on this list a great deal.

It certainly is his wish to speak for himself. He is very interested in helping the anti-tech movement in any way he can, that is why he spoke to me.

The reality is that I have so much material to transcribe and it is going to take me a while before I am in a position to work on doing that. I had never done anything like this before, I am primarily an activist. I had never interviewed anyone before TK. I did my best in writing the article.

I have agreed not to release any verbatim quotes, transcriptions or future articles until they have been checked by TK for accuracy, which is as it should be.

The next article will be more of a traditional Q & A format and should be completed and submitted for publication, most likely in Green Anarchist again, by the middle of November.

>There are a number of passages from ISAIF (Paragraph 192 especially) which
>show
>that TK is not a racist and I'm glad that you are here to support this.
>There
>is also no known evidence from his journals to support any claims of racism
>or
>neo-nazism. Who are we going to believe, the guys with the idée fixe
>(superglued) or someone who has spoken with TK?

I think TK would be very surprised to hear that such opinions are held (that he is racist, etc) I never had heard such claims before I came on this list last week.

alset
did
not
OK
it
rior
to
1.19
SA-
TK

>Just so you know, this group has been a delightful discussion center for
 >questioning technology, for environmental questions and for topics related
 >to
 >individual resistance to the troubles caused by aspects of modern life.
 >It's
 >only been during the lull of the summer and with no news that certain types
 >have decided to take this group over. Rest assured, there are a number of
 >people here who are more interested in talking to the issues you bring up
 >than
 >those sad souls are.

I came here because I wanted to see if there were people who were interested in debating the issues and I thought that TK would not mind if I posted the article to the list. After all, the GA piece is @nti-copyright and can be reproduced at will.

I visited this list when it first went up, before TK's arrest, to initiate a discussion about the anthropological thought that was contained in ISAIF. I was convinced that it had been written by someone who had studied anthropology, the analysis it contains is so perfectly in keeping with what I learned as a student of that discipline.

>>The point is to attribute these manifestations to their proper cause and
 >>try to
 >>reverse the situation; instead of just fiddling while Rome burns, suggest
 >>positive alternatives. After all, the object of the revolution is to restore
 >>harmony between humans and the natural world, not increase suffering.
 >
 >I would agree here. Now, what do you think of what TK wrote in ISAIF
 suggesting
 >that there were other possible ways that this objective might be fulfilled?
 >This is what interested me.
 >
 >-Susan

Again, I am reluctant to represent TK's thought, but one issue we discussed, which was very interesting, is the idea of a nature-based religion.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: 05 Oct 1999 14:22:52 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

>Subject: Re: TK's first interview
>From: renodecaro@aol.com (RenoDeCaro)
>Date: Mon, 04 October 1999 09:21 PM EDT
>Message-id: <19991004212121.11156.00000793@ng-cq1.aol.com>

>T.K. interview

>

>Max wrote:

>

>Why would someone tape an interview with T.K. and subsequently only publish
>a
>paraphrased version of what T.K. had to say? Even an extremely lengthy
>interview can be edited down to size.

And more of it will, with his permission. As I said in another recent post, I simply have not had time.

>The only answer I can come up with
>(assuming Greenanarchist actually interviewed T.K.) is that the interviewer
>wants to put his own interpretation and slant on what was said.
>In the past T.K., who is familiar with the way the media distorts, misquotes,
>and misrepresents those who don't fit into its agenda, has always insisted
>on
>an unedited version of his message.

For one thing, I am not a part of the corporate media, whom he has good reason to mistrust.

>In this case, we are to believe he
>allowed
>the interviewer total autonomy over what to quote, what to paraphrase, and
>what
>not to. One thing should be clear: anything attributed to T.K. from this
>interview should be suspect as to authenticity and interpretation.

I am finding the fact that some people don't believe I really talked to TK very amusing. Why do you assume that he would not trust me to simply report accurately and honestly what he had to say?

*
✱

He did read the article before it was published and he ok'd it. Why is that so hard to believe? The quotes were in quotations and they are accurate.

>The T.K. that emerges from this interview--not racist, not anti-Semitic--is
>the
>PC version of a revolutionary as is, coincidentally, the interviewer.

TK did not say anything to me that could be remotely considered racist or anti-Semitic. Nothing! It is not a matter of being PC, it is a matter of being honest.

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 19:30:49 -0400

From: Shadow <shadow42@erols.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Greenanarchist wrote:

> >>positive alternatives. After all, the object of the revolution is to restore
> >>harmony between humans and the natural world, not increase suffering.
> >
> >I would agree here. Now, what do you think of what TK wrote in ISAIF
> suggesting
> >that there were other possible ways that this objective might be fulfilled?
> >This is what interested me.
> >
> >-Susan
>
> Again, I am reluctant to represent TK's thought, but one issue we discussed,
> which was very interesting, is the idea of a nature-based religion.

I'm so intrigued to hear you say this, because this has become central to my thought as well. Religion has seemed to be one of the most powerful forces shaping culture. At least in the last 2000 years. It has not always been a force for good, either. Nevertheless, I feel it is one of the few forces which has a chance to stand up to the force of material greed which has ruled the planet for the past few centuries. Already I believe that there is a Nature religion gaining ground (pun!) in the past decade or so. Nowadays people can speak of 'Mother EArth', 'Gaia' , "Goddess" or "Mother Nature" without getting a hairy eyeball; 20 years ago, most people wouldn't know what you were talking about.

I am actually very surprised to hear TK mentioning this, because in one place I believe he had written that the 'Gaia religion' was 'play-acting' or some such disparaging comment. Nevertheless, your portrayal of TK's feelings about wild nature does suggest that he has indeed heard Mother Earth speak to him.

If so, Ted is part of a growing number of people who have heard Her voice... including myself, of course. I could write a whole book or 2 on the subject of Listening to Mother Earth...

Just curious, Green Anarchist... have you read any books by Daniel Quinn? Specifically, "The Story of B" and "Ishmael". If anyone here hasn't read them, I urge you to do so. "Story of B" in particular, has a message every bit as radical as the Unabomber Manifesto.... and yet he has managed to convey it in such an oblique way (in the guise of an 'antichrist religion') that the book is generally lumped together with the feel-good New Age category.

Thanks for joining this group. At last!! Intelligent & worthwhile dialogue!!!

Shadow

Subject: Re: TK's first interview

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 23:13:38 +0200

From: Vidar Grønvold <gronvold@powertech.no>

Organization: PowerTech, +47-2220-3330

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

On 04 Oct 1999 00:56:43 GMT, greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist) wrote:

*>Yes, this is what he said. But what he feels needs to be done, though, as
>evidenced by the Ship of Fools essay, is to redirect the rebellion to be
>against the techno-industrial system. If each interest group is just fighting
>for a bigger piece of the pie, that does nothing to hasten the collapse of the
>system.*

I'm a little surprised that neither agent99, Pyro 1488, or RenoDeCaro has come up with the idea that the Captain of the Ship of Fools is a Jew. Don't they believe their own ideas?

Well, anyhow, this part of the parable, about the Captain and his men on the deck, epitomizes the problem with it and with TK's thinking as shown by the court papers cited in this group. In his mindset there will be certain evil people which are the cause and which are to be kept responsible for the bad fate of everything. This inclination foster hate and create a link between TK and the the hate groups.

But which people can in a meaningful and intelligent way be blamed for the problems and is there any point in blaming people at all, let alone kill them?

Surely Henry Ford has been blamed for a lot and I'm sure TK would have considered sending a bomb to him, but he is dead. Maybe one should "blame" them who doesn't take any responsibility?

--

regards

Vidar Grønvold

Subject: Re: TK interview

Date: 06 Oct 1999 13:16:54 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Subject: Re: TK's first interview
From: Shadow shadow42@erols.com
Date: Tue, 05 October 1999 07:30 PM EDT
Message-id: <37FA8A29.707A@erols.com>

Shadow wrote:

>Now, what do you think of what TK wrote in ISAIF
> suggesting
> >that there were other possible ways that this objective might be fulfilled?
> >This is what interested me.
> >
> >-Susan
>
> Again, I am reluctant to represent TK's thought, but one issue we discussed,
> which was very interesting, is the idea of a nature-based religion.

>I'm so intrigued to hear you say this,
>because this has become central
to my thought as well.

And mine, when backed into a philosophical corner, I admit that what motivates me as an activist is more "spiritual" than "rational" as we understand those terms.

I have always felt a deep affinity with nature. When I consider my actions, I think of whether or not they would be approved of by the Wolf nation, the Lynx nation, the Hawk nation, the community of all living, growing, wondrous things I share this planet with, as much as, if not more than, by my fellow humans.

I know that people can speak for themselves, as a biocentric eco-anarchist, I am here to speak for that which has no representation in government, no corporate sponsor, no voice in the world of men... we can be forces of nature too.

I believe there have always been critics of civilization, perhaps destined to always be in the minority by the state of things today. But for the past 10,000 years I bet there were folks who argued that their societies should not create permanent habitations, build roads & pyramids, create armies, manipulate nature, etc... I imagine there have always been people like us, who cautioned their societies not to worship change, to walk more gently on the Earth, to go slowly and think about what they are doing in the world, to not be so arrogant with their ideas of progress, who pointed out that all life is sacred, that there is no reason to believe humans have the right to destroy Mother Earth and cause suffering to the myriad of creatures we live with.

>Religion has seemed to be one of the most
powerful forces shaping culture.
>At least in the last 2000 years. It has
not always been a force for good, either.
>Nevertheless, I feel it is one
of the few forces which has a chance
>to stand up to the force of
material greed which has ruled the planet for

>the past few centuries.

I agree, and I think what you speak of could also be considered a "worldview" rather than a religion. A worldview that respects the rights of all living things to live in peace and fulfill their destinies as part of an awe-inspiring, interconnected whole would inculcate people with values that would make the techno-industrial system appear to be the horrific aberration that it is.

>Already I believe that there is a Nature religion
>gaining ground (pun!) in the past decade or so.
>Nowadays people can speak of 'Mother Earth',
>'Gaia', "Goddess" or "Mother Nature" without
>getting a hairy eyeball;
20 years ago, most people wouldn't
>know what you were talking about.
>I am actually very surprised to hear TK mentioning
>this, because in one
place I believe he had written that
>the 'Gaia religion' was 'play-acting' or some such disparaging comment.
Nevertheless, your portrayal of
>TK's feelings about wild nature does suggest that he has
indeed heard Mother Earth speak to him.

Yes, I think it is evident in his words from the article that he does feel a deep spiritual connection to the wild. Saying that the "Gaia -religion" seems like "play acting" sometimes is something I agree with. I happen to believe that you cannot have a real affinity with something that you have little or no personal experience with. You can't truly love someone, or something, i.e. the natural world, that you don't know.

That is to say, when city people try to recreate the spirituality that comes naturally to those who interact with wilderness on a daily basis, it seems false and forced. I do not believe one can live in an artificial, human-centered urban environment and be confronted with the sensations that induces on a daily basis and still be truly connected spiritually with the wild. You must walk the walk to authentically talk the talk. I personally feel that only when people get back into the wilderness and actually live in harmony with wild nature again will they find the emotional strength and courage to accomplish what needs to be accomplished for the revolution to succeed, since that is the actual source of the strength.

>If so, Ted is part of a growing number of people
>who have heard Her
voice... including myself, of course. I could write a whole book or 2 on
>the subject of Listening to Mother Earth...

You should!

>Just curious, Green Anarchist... have you read any
books by Daniel Quinn? Specifically,
>"The Story of B" and "Ishmael". If anyone here
hasn't read them, I urge you to do so.
>"Story of B" in particular, has a
message every bit as radical as the
>Unabomber Manifesto....

Yes, these are very important text that I and most of my friends have read.

>Thanks for joining this group.
>At last!! Intelligent & worthwhile

dialogue!!!

>Shadow

Thanks for being so welcoming...

Green Anarchist